

authority of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) (21 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*). The FDA published a statement of policy on foods derived from new plant varieties in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22984-23005). The FDA statement of policy includes a discussion of the FDA's authority for ensuring food safety under the FFDCA, and provides guidance to industry on the scientific considerations associated with the development of foods derived from new plant varieties, including those plants developed through the techniques of genetic engineering. Zeneca has notified the FDA that it has completed its food safety and nutritional assessment for the subject tomato lines.

In accordance with § 340.6(d) of the regulations, we are publishing this notice to inform the public that APHIS will accept written comments regarding the Petition for Determination of Nonregulated Status from any interested person for a period of 60 days from the date of this notice. The petition and any comments received are available for public review, and copies of the petition may be ordered (see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice).

After the comment period closes, APHIS will review the data submitted by the petitioner, all written comments received during the comment period, and any other relevant information. Based on the available information, APHIS will furnish a response to the petitioners, either approving the petition in whole or in part, or denying the petition. APHIS will then publish a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the regulatory status of Zeneca/Petoseed's tomato lines B, Da, and F and the availability of APHIS' written decision.

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 150aa-150jj, 151-167, and 1622n; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(c).

Done in Washington, DC, this 13th day of March 1995.

**Terry L. Medley,**

*Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 95-6651 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

## Forest Service

### Elsmere Canyon Proposed Solid Waste Management Facility

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Revised date for end of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Angeles National Forest made available an Environmental

Impact Statement for the Elsmere Canyon Proposed Solid Waste Management Facility on January 20, 1995. This was announced in the **Federal Register** / Vol. 60, No. 13 / Friday, January 20, 1995 by the Environmental Protection Agency, under the Environmental Impact Statements, Notice of Availability. The EIS No. is 950009, Draft EIS. The comment period was to end on April 28, 1995.

The Angeles National Forest has extended the comment period. Comments are due by close of business, August 4, 1995.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Paul Johnson, Deputy Forest Supervisor at 818-574-5217 or Charles McDonald at 818-574-5257 or written questions may be directed to the U.S. Forest Service, Elsmere EIS, 701 N. Santa Anita Ave., Arcadia, CA 91006.

Dated: March 10, 1995.

**Paul Johnson,**

*Deputy Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 95-6633 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### Beaver/Cedar Land Exchange; Clearwater National Forest; Clearwater and Latah Counties, Idaho

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice; Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Clearwater National Forest, with assistance from Potlatch Corporation, will prepare an EIS (environmental impact statement) for a proposal to exchange National Forest land for Potlatch owned land. The project area is located on the North Fork Ranger District on the Clearwater National Forest and the Palouse Ranger District on the St. Joe National Forest and administered by the Clearwater National Forest, head-quartered in Orofino, Idaho. The Agreement to Initiate a land exchange was signed by Potlatch Corporation on September 17, 1993, and the Forest Service on October 8, 1993. This exchange is proposed pursuant to the General Exchange Acts of March 1, 1911 and March 20, 1922, as amended, and the Federal Land Policy Management Act of October 21, 1976.

The EIS will tier to the Clearwater National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Final EIS of September, 1987, which provides overall guidance of all land management activities on the Clearwater National Forest. Analyses will also be conducted

in compliance with the Stipulation of Dismissal agreed to for the lawsuit between the Forest Service and the Sierra Club, et al (signed September 13, 1993).

The agency invites written comments and suggestions on the issues and management opportunities for the area being analyzed.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received within 45 days following publication of this notice to receive timely consideration in the preparation of the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS is anticipated to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency in August 1995. The Final EIS and Record of Decision are expected to be issued in December of 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments and suggestions on the proposed action or requests to be placed on the project mailing list to James L. Caswell, Forest Supervisor, Clearwater National Forest, 12730 U.S. Highway 12, Orofino, ID, 83544. FAX: 208-476-8329.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bill Jones, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, Clearwater National Forest, Supervisor's Office, telephone (208) 476-4541.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Potlatch Corporation owns approximately thirty-seven sections of land, each containing approximately 640 acres, within the Cedars-Trout area of the North Fork Ranger District. These sections alternate with National Forest sections, and together they comprise what is referred to as a "checkerboard" area on the Clearwater National Forest. The majority of this area is unroaded and is adjacent to the Upper North Fork and Great Burn roadless areas. Large portions of the area were impacted by the 1910 burn and have returned to stands of lodgepole pine, where as, the unburned areas support stands of western redcedar, grand fir, Douglas-fir, western larch, Engelmann spruce, and subalpine fir. A good elk population inhabits the area, as do mule deer, white tail deer, moose, mountain lion, river otter, black bear, and maybe some mountain goats in the higher elevations. Fishing is excellent with an abundance of cutthroat trout and bull trout, with some brook trout in the smaller cold streams. The area contains the popular Cedars Campground and is adjacent to a lot of historic gold mining activity in Moose City and the surrounding country.

The Beaver Block, owned by the Forest Service, is characterized as an island of timber surrounded by cut-over private lands. It has a good gravel road

system and has been intensively managed since the 1940's. The area is very productive due to a good ash cap, that once supported large stands of western white pine. Western redcedar, grand fir, Douglas-fir, and minor amounts of Engelmann spruce, western white pine, ponderosa pine, and western larch now inhabit the area. The area provides excellent habitat for elk, and its rolling dissected topography is a favorite place for big-game hunters. Also present are moose, black bear, and white tail deer. Fishing is fair and is limited to brook trout in the South Fork of Beaver Creek. There is a lot of historic evidence of old logging cord wood roads and camp sites within the area.

The Clearwater Forest Plan provides guidance for land exchange within the potentially affected area through its goals, objectives, standards, guidelines and management area direction. The areas of proposed land exchange would occur mostly within Management Area E1. There are several inclusions of Management Area C4 within the Beaver Block area. Below is a brief description of the applicable management direction.

Management Area E1—Timber Management—Provide optimum, sustained production of timber products in a cost-effective manner while protecting soil and water quality. Lands Goal—Seek opportunities to consolidate land ownership through land exchange.

Management Area C4—Elk Winter Range/Timber—Provide sufficient winter forage and thermal cover for existing and projected big game populations while achieving timber production outputs. Lands Goal—Acquire private inholdings.

Initial negotiations began in 1985 with DAW Forest Products Company on a land exchange involving federal and non-federal parcels within the Cedars-Trout area. DAW later decided to get out of the area totally in favor of acquiring federal property on the Lolo National Forest to facilitate their mill in Superior, Montana. As this would take legislative action, DAW did not pursue this action and decided to not engage in a land exchange.

In January 1993, the Clearwater National Forest was approached by a local real estate representative wanting to know if the Forest would be interested in a land exchange involving DAW, the State of Idaho, and the Forest Service. Under this proposal, DAW would exchange their lands in the Cedars-Trout area to the State of Idaho for some State land near St. Maries, Idaho. The State would in turn exchange their newly acquired Cedars-Trout parcels for the federally owned Beaver Block. Before this proposal could

be acted upon, all of the property owned by DAW went up for sale.

Later that year Potlatch Corporation informed the Forest that they were interested in purchasing the Cedars-Trout area from DAW, and asked if the Forest would be interested in a land exchange for the Beaver Block. On August 19, 1993, a letter was sent to Potlatch Corporation stating the Forest was interested in the exchange, but, with no guarantees that the exchange would be consummated. After some internal scoping, an Agreement to initiate was signed by both Potlatch Corporation and the Forest Service. Later in September, Potlatch Corporation and Bennett Lumber Company co-purchased the Cedars-Trout area as well as the other DAW owned lands on the Palouse Ranger District. Potlatch Corporation is currently giving Bennett Lumber Company some of their other land holdings in exchange for sole ownership of the newly acquired DAW lands.

As a result of internal scoping and negotiations with Potlatch, the following tracts are being proposed for exchange: Nonfederal Land (Property that Potlatch Corporation will consider exchanging)

Location	Acres	Total
T40N, R10E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District: Sec 1 Lots 1-4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ ...	.....	650.08
T40N, R11E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District: Sec 1 Lots 1-4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ . Sec 3 Lots 1-4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ ... Sec 4 Lots 2,4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ..... Sec 5 Lots 1-4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ . Sec 7 Lots 1,2, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec 8 N $\frac{1}{2}$ ,W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec 9 all ..... Sec 10 all ..... Sec 11 all ..... Sec 13 all ..... Sec 14 all ..... Sec 15 N $\frac{1}{2}$ ,SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ..... Sec 23 E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	649.28 652.24 368.27 650.08 388.49 400.00 640.00 640.00 640.00 640.00 560.00 080.00	6,948.36

Location	Acres	Total
T40N, R12E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District: Sec 5 Lots 1-4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ . Sec 7 Lots 1-4, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,E $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec 9 all ..... Sec 17 all ..... Sec 19 Lots 1,2, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	648.88 618.80 640.00 640.00 390.48	2,938.16
T41N, R10E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District: Sec 13 all ..... Sec 23 all ..... Sec 25 all ..... Sec 27 all ..... Sec 33 all ..... Sec 35 all .....	640.00 640.00 640.00 640.00 640.00 640.00	3,840.00
T41N, R11E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District: Sec 3 Lots 1-4, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ . Sec 9 all ..... Sec 11 all ..... Sec 15 all ..... Sec 17 all ..... Sec 19 Lots 1-4, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,E $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec 21 all ..... Sec 23 all ..... Sec 25 all ..... Sec 28 SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ..... Sec 29 all ..... Sec 31 Lots 1-4, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,E $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec 32 all ..... Sec 33 all ..... Sec 35 all .....	644.04 640.00 640.00 640.00 640.00 631.36 640.00 640.00 640.00 160.000 640.00 638.00 640.00 640.00 640.00 Subtotal acres in Cedars-Trout area ..	9,113.40 23,490.00
<b>Nonfederal Land in the Neva Hill Area</b>		
T40N, R1E, Clearwater County, Palouse Ranger District: Sec 22 NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	.....	40.00

Location	Acres	Total	Location	Acres	Total	Location	Acres	Total
<b>Nonfederal Land in the Elk Creek Drainage</b>			Sec 33			Sec 25 all .....	640.00	
T39N, R2E, Clearwater County, Palouse Ranger District:			N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			Sec 26 all .....	640.00	
Sec 11			NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			Sec 27 E $\frac{1}{2}$ ,		
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	40.00		NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
Sec 14 E $\frac{1}{2}$ ,			N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	440.00	
SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	400.00		Sec 34 NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			Sec 30 Lots 3,4,			N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	480.00		SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	320.00	
Sec 15 Lots 3,4,			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	156.56	1,750.52	Sec 35		
E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,						NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			T39N, R6E, Clearwater County,			S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	279.08		North Fork			NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
Sec 21 Lots 2,3,	86.10		Ranger District:			N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
Sec 22 E $\frac{1}{2}$ ,			Sec 4 Lots 3,4,			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	280.00	
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			Sec 36		
E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,		
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	480.00	1,365.18	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	285.66		W $\frac{1}{2}$ ,W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	480.00	7,837.16
			Sec 5 Lots 1-4,			Total Federal Acres Identified for Exchange .....	15,831.73	
<b>Nonfederal Land in the Columbia Mine Area</b>			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
T42N, R1W, Latah County, Palouse Ranger District:			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	649.20				
Sec 7 Mineral			Sec 6 Lots 1-7,					
Survey 3311 ..	34.09		SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
Sec 8 Mineral			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
Survey 3311 ..	45.00	79.09	E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,	638.49				
			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....					
<b>Nonfederal Land in the Mt. Gulch Area</b>			Sec 7 Lots 1-4,					
T43N, R1W, Latah County, Palouse Ranger District:			E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ ,E $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	637.20				
Sec 31 Mineral			Sec 8 all .....	640.00				
Survey 2425 .....			Sec 9 W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
Subtotal acres on Palouse Ranger District .....	1,540.89		NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
Total Nonfederal land for possible acquisition .....	25,030.89		N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
Outstanding Rights: Subject to the rights of the United States and third parties recited in the patent from the United States.			SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	360.00				
			Sec 16 NW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	160.00				
<b>Federal lands (Property the Forest Service Will Consider Exchanging)</b>			Sec 17 all .....	640.00				
T40N, R6E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District:			Sec 18 Lots 1-4,					
Sec 31 Lots 1-4,			E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	637.64				
E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	633.96		Sec 19 Lots 1-4,					
Sec 32			E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	637.32				
W $\frac{1}{2}$ ,SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,			Sec 20 N $\frac{1}{2}$ ,					
S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	560.00		N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ ,					
			SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	560.00				
			Sec 30 Lots 1-4,					
			NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	358.72				
			Sec 31 Lot 1 .....	39.82	6,244.05			
			T39N, R5E, Clearwater County, North Fork Ranger District:					
			Sec 1 Lots 1-4,					
			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	639.44				
			Sec 2 Lots 1-4,					
			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,S $\frac{1}{2}$ ..	637.72				
			Sec 11 NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	520.00				
			Sec 12 all .....	640.00				
			Sec 13 all .....	640.00				
			Sec 14 all .....	640.00				
			Sec 15					
			E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ,					
			S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	320.00				
			Sec 23 E $\frac{1}{2}$ ,					
			NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ .....	360.00				
			Sec 24 all .....	640.00				

Land reservations of the United States, exceptions to title and uses to be recognized.

A range of alternatives will be considered, including a no action alternative and the proposal identified above. Based on the issues identified through scoping, all action alternatives will vary in the number of acres to be exchanged, the location of the acres to be exchanged, and the kind of mitigation measures. Issues will drive the formulation of feasible alternatives, as will acceptance of each alternative by Potlatch Corporation and the Forest Service.

The EIS will analyze the direct, indirect and cumulative environmental effects of the alternatives. Past, present and projected activities on both private and National Forest lands will be considered. The EIS will disclose the analysis of site-specific mitigation measures and their effectiveness.

Comments from the public and other agencies will be used in preparation of the Draft EIS.

The scoping process will continue to be used to:

1. Identify potential issues.
2. Identify major issues to be analyzed in depth.
3. Eliminate minor issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis, such as the Clearwater Forest Plan EIS.
4. Identify alternatives to the proposed action.
5. Identify potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives (i.e., direct, indirect and cumulative effects).
6. Determine potential cooperating agencies and task assignments.

Preliminary issues identified as a result of internal and public scoping include: equal value of land being exchanged, plus, effects of the proposal on wildlife habitat, old growth habitat, water quality, riparian areas, fisheries, roadless areas, federal investigations already made, revenues to the counties, road access, deferred road maintenance, fire protection boundaries, timber program, visual quality of the area, recreation, and effects on threatened, endangered and sensitive species. This list will be verified, expanded and/or modified based on continued scoping for this proposal.

Public participation is important all through the analysis process. Two key time periods have been identified for receipt of formal comments on the proposal and analysis:

1. Scoping period, which starts with publication of this notice and continues for the next 45 days; and
2. Review of the Draft EIS in September and October, 1995.

The Forest Service expects to file the Draft EIS with the Environmental Protection Agency in August 1995. The comment period on the Draft EIS will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**. The Final EIS and Record of Decision are expected in December 1995.

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of a draft EIS must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft EIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wisc. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the Final EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues on the proposed action, comments on the Draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments

refer to specific pages or chapters of the Draft EIS.

Comments may also address the adequacy of the Draft EIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. (Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.)

I am the responsible official for this environmental impact statement. My address is Clearwater National Forest, Forest Supervisor's Office, 12730 Highway 12, Orofino, ID 83544.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

**James L. Caswell,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 95-6551 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

#### **Nosiy Divide Timber Sale and Other Integrated Resource Projects, Colville National Forest, Pend Oreille County, WA**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Cancellation Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service, USDA, is no longer involved in the preparation of an environmental impact statement for the Noisy Divide Timber Sale and Other Integrated Resource Projects on the Sullivan Lake Ranger District of the Colville National Forest (Pend Oreille County, Washington). The Notice of Intent, published in the **Federal Register** on January 2, 1991 is hereby rescinded (56 FR 58).

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Tim Bertram, Project Leader, Sullivan Lake Ranger District, Colville National Forest; at Metaline Falls, Washington 99153, or phone 509-446-2681.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

**George T. Buckingham,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 95-6626 Filed 3-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

#### **North Sherman and Fritz Timber Sales, Colville National Forest, Ferry County, WA**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice; intent to prepare environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service, USDA, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to harvest and regenerate timber and to construct and reconstruct roads. The proposed

projects will be in compliance with the 1988 Colville National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (The Plan) which provides the overall guidance for management of this area for the next ten years. The projects are proposed within portions of the Sherman Creek and South Fork Sherman Creek drainages on the Kettle Falls Ranger District in fiscal year 1996. The Colville National Forest invites written comments and suggestions on the scope of the analysis. The agency will give notice of the full environmental analysis and decision making process that will occur on the proposal so as to provide interested and affected people awareness as to how they may participate and contribute in the final decision.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received in writing by April 30, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments and suggestions concerning the management of this area to Meredith Webster, District Ranger, 225 W. 11th, Kettle Falls, Washington 99141.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Questions about the proposed project work and EIS should be directed to Ralph Egan, Planning Assistant, 225 W. 11th, Kettle Falls, Washington 99141 (phone: 509-738-6111).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed action includes harvesting timber and constructing roads on North Sherman and Fritz timber sales.

The timber sales are proposed within the Sherman Creek and South Fork Sherman Creek drainages on the Kettle Falls Ranger District. This analysis will evaluate a range of alternatives for implementation of the timber sales. The area being analyzed is 69,557 acres.

The North Sherman timber sale would be located north of Washington State Highway 20 with the proposed harvest centered between McGahee and Elbow Creeks. The majority of the harvest would be landscape scale selection harvest. The proposed sale would harvest 10.0 MMBF from 2,000 acres.

The Fritz timber sale would be located south of Washington State Highway 20 with the proposed harvest centered around upper Fritz Creek, Scalawag Ridge and Paradise Peak. The majority of the harvest would be landscape scale selection harvest. The proposed sale would harvest 10.0 MMBF from 2,000 acres.

The Draft EIS will be tiered to The Plan. The Plan's Management Area direction for this analysis area is approximately 4.1 percent Old Growth Dependent Species Habitat, 8.3 percent Recreation, 30 percent Scenic/Timber, 1.3 percent Scenic/Winter Range, 22.1